REMARKS

The claims of this application have been substantially amended, primarily to overcome the problems as raised by the examiner. Furthermore, the claims have been defined more in terms of structure, rather than function, as further questioned by the examiner.

Essentially, the secure cage of this invention from what had generally been defined in earlier claim 14, depicts a particular type of secure cage, for use especially within a manhole structure, primarily for providing security, isolation, and protection for the spliced dedicated cables for an individual customer, particularly since the manhole structure may include other cables to a variety of customers, all of which are intended to be isolated form each other, and protected, through the usage of the secure cage of this invention. The structure of this device is really somewhat different from what is explained in the prior art patents as reviewed by the examiner, they have totally different function, none of which even remotely suggest this current invention, from said prior art as cited by the examiner.

And, as the examiner knows, particularly since claim 14 was previously rejected by him under §103, obviousness can not be established by combining teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting that combination. See the case of In re Geiger, 815 Fed. 2nd 686 (Fed. Cert. 1987).

The Boer reference cited by the examiner is simply a display system. It may have panels, that appear to be held together by key members 50, but they may also be held together by straps, as can be seen in FIG. 17, at least with respect to the juncture between its panels 16, and the side panels, as noted. But, there is nothing provided upon the back edge of the side panels which would allow them to be permanently affixed or removably affixed to a manhole structure, or its wall, as clearly defined for the current invention, nor is anything even remotely suggested in Boer that would give rise to that type of structure, in the first instance.

In addition, Boer just does not show any type of a device or angle for securing the back edge of the side panels to any manhole wall structure.

In Norman, as further reviewed by the examiner, may show some type of an auxiliary fold-out room, and frankly, it would appear to be a stretch of the imagination to take some of the structure out of Norman, and attempt to place it into the structure of the display system of Boer, to come up with answering structure to Applicant's claimed invention. Boer, as previously explained, really does not provide or even suggest the type of structure that could accommodate, at least along the back edges of its side wall panels, any type of angle or hasp that could be removably connected to a wall of a manhole structure, and does not even suggest how that type of adaptation could be made, to provide structure that can accommodate the type of insertion and fixation to a manhole structure, for the Applicant's intended purpose. It is believed that this is what the case of In re Geiger was attempting to decide, when it said the prior art must suggest in a direction and towards the combination, as for the usage of the current invention, otherwise, it does not form a proper basis for obviousness.

Cucksey may show a hoist way door assembly, and while it may show its hoist way door assemblies being stacked, as in FIG. 3, and even having perforations, it does not appear to state what the perforations are for, although we would presume that it is to provide some type of ventilation. To take this type of structure, and embody it into Norman's room, and then to apply all that to the structure of the Boer display system, it is believed, is contrary to what is suggested in all of these various prior art patents, and it just does not make it obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the said art into a secure cage, in the first instance, as claimed for the current invention.

Laetsch may describe, in a single instance, that repeaters of a telecommunications network may be placed in a manhole, and also simply defines the use of a standard cabinet, as can be seen in FIG. 3e, as just one embodiment for a cabinet that can hold the repeaters in place, even in a manhole. But, Applicant does not claim to be the first to provide for the location of telecommunications, or electronic housings, or anything related, in a manhole, but rather, is providing for a particular style of secure cage, that can perform in just that manner, to secure the individual customers cable system within a manhole, isolate them from other customers cables, but yet provide a secure cage that can be folded, collapsed, and easily inserted into the manhole, or removed thereto, and once installed permanently against the wall of the manhole structure, it can yet have its various hasp and angles unlocked, to provide for opening or collapsing of the cage, to allow for the variety of lengths of fiber optic cables to be pulled up to the surface, and worked upon at ground level, in a trailer or other vehicle, as used in the splicing process, as Applicant describes on page 4 of his specification. This is clearly not the subject matter of what is defined or suggested in Laetsch, nor is it seen how Laetsch defines anything other than the use of a cabinet, for holding electronics, which are totally unrelated to the display system of Boer, in the first instance.

With respect to the use of angles and hasp, the examiner states that Norman teaches the use of a hasp device. Actually, Norman supplies a slide lock, on the front of his top and bottom panels, which would not provide the function of Applicant's method for removably locking back edges of his side panels to the manhole structure. Norman shows the use of hinges 180, but once the exposed pins are removed from the hinges, those walls can be removed. This does not provide the type of isolation and security that Applicant seeks for his secure cage. It is quite obvious that Norman was not even thinking of terms of isolation and security, when designing his fold-out room, even if somehow Norman should be adapted into the structure to modify Boer, and his display system, as the examiner states as a basis for rejection.

The fact that Boer may disclose hinges, or flexible members, it is submitted, the use of those in Boer's display system, just does not suggest, or render obvious, the particular style of secure cage as developed by Applicant. Furthermore, various types of displays, as in Boer, probably are more readily shown in FIGS. 8 and 9, which present displays apparently for advertising purposes, display purposes, and really have nothing to do with the structured development of a secure cage, of the type as claimed, for this current invention.

The examiner's further review of the claims of this application as amended would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul M. Denk
Attorney for Applicants';
Pat. Off. Reg. No. 22,598
763 South New Ballas Road, Ste. 170
St. Louis, Missouri 63141
(314) 872-8136

PMD/sm